

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 3

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 16 is amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claim 1 of Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 5,530,437) and Tani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,559,526). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to MPEP § 804, a double patenting rejection of the obviousness-type is "analogous to [a failure to meet] the nonobviousness requirement of 35 U.S.C. 103" except that the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art. *In re Braithwaite*, 379 F.2d 594, 154 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1967). Therefore, any analysis employed in an obviousness-type double patenting rejection parallels the guidelines for analysis of a 35 U.S.C. 103 obviousness determination. *In re Braat*, 937 F.2d 589, 19 USPQ2d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Goldberg discloses a method of determining identities of respondents to a poll transmitted by a fixed communication unit in a radio communication system including a central controller, a plurality of portable communication units, and the fixed communication unit. The fixed communication unit has a transmitter and a plurality of receivers. The method includes programming a plurality of bit patterns within a subset of the plurality of portable communication units for identifying individual portable communication units of the subset. Each bit pattern corresponds uniquely to a portable communication unit and is chosen such that when a group of at least two of the portable communication units are received simultaneously by a receiver of the plurality of receivers, thereby producing an interference bit pattern in the receiver, the interference bit pattern provides a non-zero probability of correctly identifying at least a portion of the group, and a substantially zero probability of erroneously identifying a portable communication unit not in the group. The method further comprises the steps of transmitting thereafter from the subset a plurality of simultaneous, co-channel responses to the poll, a response comprising one of the plurality of bit patterns transmitted without modification, exactly

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 4

as programmed, and determining therefrom identities of received portable communication units of the subset by the interference bit patterns received by the plurality of receivers.

According to another aspect, Goldberg discloses an apparatus in a radio communication system for transmitting a poll and determining identities of respondents to the poll. The apparatus includes a central controller for controlling the radio communication system, and a fixed communication unit coupled to the central controller for transmitting the poll and further for receiving a response to the poll. The fixed communication unit has a transmitter and a plurality of receivers positioned in geographically disperse locations. The apparatus further includes a plurality of portable communication units coupled to the fixed communication unit for receiving the poll and generating a response, and a programmer for coupling to ones of the plurality of portable communication units for programming therein a plurality of bit patterns for identifying each individual portable communication unit within a subset of the plurality of portable communication units. Each bit pattern corresponds uniquely to a portable communication unit and is chosen such that when a group of at least two of the portable communication units are received simultaneously by a receiver of the plurality of receivers, thereby producing an interference bit pattern in the receiver, the interference bit pattern provides a non-zero probability of correctly identifying at least a portion of the group, and a substantially zero probability of erroneously identifying a portable communication unit not in the group (col. 1, line 54 - col. 2, line 38).

Tani et al. discloses a security alarm system including a plurality of sensors for detecting emergencies in a predetermined guard area; a transmitter-receiver for converting the emergency data into electric signals and transmitting the electric signals by radio; a repeater for receiving the electric signals from the transmitter-receiver and transmitting the signals thereon; a security controller, receiving the signals, for setting a guard mode such as "start watch" and "release watch" and transmitting the emergency data and the guard mode signal thereon using a transmission line, including a telephone cable, a leased line or radio; and a central station, receiving the data, for supervising the predetermined guard area based on the data from this and other security controllers in other premises (col. 1, line 55 - col. 2, line 2).

Serial No. 09/611.633

Page 5

The Office Action alleges the first limitation of claim 1 is claimed in Goldberg at col. 12, lines 61-67. Applicant disagrees. Goldberg does not claim "canned messages." In particular, canned messages can be pre-programmed messages. For example, these pre-programmed messages can be sent in response to triggering events. To the contrary, the bit patterns claimed in Goldberg are explicitly claimed to "identify individual portable communication units." Thus, the bit patterns are not "messages" sent by communication units, but are, in fact, identification patterns identifying the units themselves. Therefore, the bit patterns are not canned messages.

The Office Action alleges it is implied in col. 13, lines 7-11 that each subset is assigned a response time slot. Applicant disagrees. It is not implied or claimed to utilize time slots for transmissions. In particular, col. 13, lines 7-11 expressly state responses are transmitted simultaneously. "Simultaneously" means at the same time, not necessarily in assigned time slots. Furthermore, simultaneous transmission may include frequency division multiplexed transmissions or code division multiplexed transmissions. These transmission techniques are not time slot transmission techniques. Thus, it is not implied or claimed to utilize time slots for transmissions.

The Office Action takes Official Notice that slotted Aloha is a commonly used technique for communications resource assignment in radio based telecommunications and that random time slot selection reduces collisions. Applicant disagrees and traverses this allegation in accordance with MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant asserts that not only was it not well-known to use a random slot to reduce collisions, but also that there is no motivation to utilize such a technique with the cited Goldberg reference.

The Office Action admits the features of detecting and selecting are not taught by Goldberg, but alleges these features are obvious in view of Tani et al.

Applicant asserts neither Goldberg nor Tani et al. provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Goldberg with the teachings of Tani et al. Goldberg does not offer any motivation. In particular, Goldberg is expressly directed to the collision problem that results from multiple responses to a poll (col. 1, lines 15-50, and specifically, lines 36-44). There is no disclosure of using such a poll in a security system. Thus, there is no reason to apply the teachings of Goldberg to a security system. In fact, Goldberg has no disclosure of

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 6

any relationship to security systems. Goldberg only recognizes collisions may result from multiple responses to a poll. In fact, Goldberg entirely directs all disclosed methods to specifically responding to a poll (col. 1, lines 9-11 and lines 54-57 and col. 2, lines 13-15). Thus, Goldberg does not even fathom any problem or offer any improvement that would provide motivation to modify the teachings of Tani et al. Additionally, there is no motivation in Goldberg to improve on any method other than a method of responding to a poll. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the poll responding method of Goldberg to modify the security system of Tani et al.

Furthermore, Tani et al. also does not offer any motivation. In particular, Tani et al. does not identify any problem or offer any improvements over Goldberg. More particularly, Tani et al. only addresses security alarm systems. Tani et al. does not even mention any improvement on radio communication systems that utilize polling. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the security system of Tani et al. to modify the poll responding method of Goldberg. In fact, neither Tani et al., nor Goldberg identify any usefulness of selecting a plurality of canned messages corresponding to a plurality of orthogonal codes in response to a triggering event.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges Tani et al. is in an analogous art to Goldberg. Applicant disagrees. In particular, Goldberg is in a non-analogous art to both Tani et al. and the present invention. According to MPEP § 2141.01(a), "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, the be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." However, Goldberg does not relate to sending canned messages in response to triggering events not controlled by a wireless system. Goldberg is directed to a method for generating a simulcast response to a poll (col. 1, lines 8-11). To the contrary, the claimed invention does not require the use of any polling.

Furthermore, Tani et al. is directed to an entirely different field from Goldberg. Tani et al. is directed to security systems that may transmit emergency data via radio. There is no mention in Tani et al. of sending responses to polls. Furthermore, there is no mention in Goldberg of security systems. The only similarity between the two references is that both

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 7

mention wireless communications. However, due to the fact that wireless communications is such a diverse field, this similarity does not rise to similar arts. In particular, Goldberg is narrowly directed to radio communication systems that utilize polling. To the contrary, Tani et al. has no mention of such polling. Tani et al. only mentions radio communications in a broad sense to address security systems. Therefore, Tani et al. is in a non-analogous art to Goldberg.

The Office Action alleges one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would modify the method of Goldberg as taught by Tani et al. because the steps of detecting a triggering event and transmitting canned messages regarding the triggering event to a central station provide an inexpensive and easy-to-install means for monitoring an area. However, none of these benefits are cited in either of these references to provide motivation for combining one reference with the other. The fact that one or another reference is expensive and easy to install does not give motivation to combine that reference with the other. The references must be viewed without the benefit impermissible hindsight afforded by the claimed invention. In this case, the references do not provide motivation for looking to each other for combination with each other. Furthermore, there is no reason provided why or how the cited steps provide "an inexpensive and easy-to-install means for monitoring an area."

Additionally, according to MPEP § 2143.01, there are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art. No motivation has been provided by any of these sources. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Tani et al. with the teachings of Goldberg.

The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 10, 16, and 19-21 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claims 1, 8, 9, and 12-14 of Goldberg. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Office Action admits that Goldberg does not teach the features of detecting and selecting recited in claim 1. Claims 2 and 10 are dependent from and incorporate all of the recited features of claim 1. Thus, Goldberg does not claim the features of claims 2 and 10. Additionally, Goldberg does not claim at least two different canned messages selected in response to a triggering event as recited in independent claim 16, and recited in

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 8

claims 19-21 by dependency. As mentioned above, the Office Action admits Goldberg does not even disclose this feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, claims 16-21 over Goldberg. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant asserts that Goldberg does not disclose or suggest at least two different canned messages selected in response to a triggering event as recited in independent claim 16. The Office Action admits that Goldberg does not teach the feature of selecting. Thus, Applicant submits claim 16 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 17-21 depend from independent claim 16 and therefore also define patentable subject matter.

The Office Action also rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, claims 1-4, 10-12, and 15 over Goldberg and Tani et al., claims 1, 5, and 7 over Goldberg and Fish (U.S. Patent No. 5,166,664), claims 6, 8, and 9 over Goldberg, Fish, and Reis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,613), claims 11 and 13 over Goldberg and Lemelson (U.S. Patent No. 6,054,928), and claim 14 over Goldberg, Tani et al., and Fish. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine any of the references to achieve the invention claimed in independent claim 1, and similarly claimed in independent claims 11 and 16.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure (MPEP 2142). The prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention (MPEP 2143.01).

Goldberg does not disclose utilizing time slots for transmissions. In particular, col. 13, lines 7-11 expressly state responses are transmitted simultaneously. "Simultaneously" means at

Serial No. 09/611.633

Page 9

the same time, not necessarily in assigned time slots. Furthermore, simultaneous transmission may include frequency division multiplexed transmissions or code division multiplexed transmissions. These transmission techniques are not time slot transmission techniques. Thus, it is not even inherent in Goldberg to utilize time slots for transmissions.

The Office Action admits the features of detecting and selecting are not taught by Goldberg, but alleges these features are obvious in view of Tani et al.

Applicant asserts neither Goldberg nor Tani et al. provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Goldberg with the teachings of Tani et al. Goldberg does not offer any such motivation. In particular, Goldberg is expressly directed to the collision problem that results from multiple responses to a poll (col. 1, lines 15-50, and specifically, lines 36-44). There is no disclosure of using such a poll in a security system. Thus, there is no reason to apply the teachings of Goldberg to a security system. In fact, Goldberg has no disclosure of any relationship to security systems. Goldberg only recognizes collisions may result from multiple responses to a poll. In fact, Goldberg entirely directs all disclosed methods to specifically responding to a poll (col. 1, lines 9-11 and lines 54-57 and col. 2, lines 13-15). Thus, Goldberg does not even fathom any problem or offer any improvement that would provide motivation to modify the teachings of Tani et al. Additionally, there is no motivation in Goldberg to improve on any method other than a method of responding to a poll. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the poll responding method of Goldberg to modify the security system of Tani et al.

Furthermore, Tani et al. also does not offer any motivation to combine the references. In particular, Tani et al. does not identify any problem or offer any improvements over Goldberg. More particularly, Tani et al. only addresses security alarm systems. Tani et al. does not even mention any improvement on radio communication systems that utilize polling. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the security system of Tani et al. to modify the poll responding method of Goldberg. In fact, neither Tani et al., nor Goldberg identify any usefulness of selecting a plurality of canned messages corresponding to a plurality of orthogonal codes in response to a triggering event.

Serial No. 09/611,633
Page 10

The Office Action also alleges "it is understood... a polling signal transmitted by the central controller 102 is a triggering event." Applicant disagrees. Goldberg explicitly states the controller 102 is part of the communication system 100. To the contrary, claim 1 expressly recites the triggering event does not originate from the wireless communication system. Thus, a polling signal transmitted by the controller 102 cannot be a triggering event that does not originate from the wireless communication system.

The Office Action further alleges the first set of code indicating a subset /group and the second code indicating a unique identification are canned messages. Applicant disagrees. The claimed canned messages can be pre-programmed messages. For example, these pre-programmed messages can be sent in response to triggering events. To the contrary, the bit patterns disclosed in Goldberg are explicitly claimed to "identify individual portable communication units." Thus, the bit patterns are not "messages" sent by communication units, but are, in fact, identification patterns identifying the units themselves. Therefore, the bit patterns are not canned messages.

The Office Action additionally alleges it is understood the central controller 102 randomly selects the assigned timeslot. Applicant disagrees. Goldberg expressly states in the background section that a system that utilizes polling can control each pager to respond at a specific time. Because Goldberg teaches a modification to such a system, Goldberg teaches that specific times are used as opposed to random timeslots. Accordingly, Goldberg teaches away from randomly selecting an assigned timeslot.

Also, the Office Action alleges Tani et al. is in an analogous art to Goldberg. Applicant disagrees. In particular, Goldberg is in a non-analogous art to both Tani et al. and the present invention. According to MPEP § 2141.01(a), "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, the be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." However, Goldberg does not relate to sending canned messages in response to triggering events not controlled by a wireless system. Goldberg is directed to a method for generating a simulcast response to a poll (col. 1, lines 8-11). To the contrary, the claimed invention does not require the use of any polling.

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 11

Furthermore, Tani et al. is directed to an entirely different field from Goldberg. Tani et al. is directed to security systems that may transmit emergency data via radio. There is no mention in Tani et al. of sending responses to polls. Furthermore, there is no mention in Goldberg of security systems. The only similarity between the two references is that both mention wireless communications. However, due to the fact that wireless communications is such a diverse field, this similarity does not rise to similar arts. In particular, Goldberg is narrowly directed to radio communication systems that utilize polling. To the contrary, Tani et al. has no mention of such polling. Tani et al. only mentions radio communications in a broad sense to address security systems. Therefore, Tani et al. is in a non-analogous art to Goldberg.

The Office Action alleges one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would modify the method of Goldberg as taught by Tani et al. because the steps of detecting a triggering event and transmitting canned messages regarding the triggering event to a central station provide an "inexpensive and easy-to-install" means for monitoring an area. However, none of these benefits are cited in either of these references to provide motivation for combining one reference with the other. The fact that one or another reference is expensive and easy to install does not give motivation to combine that reference with the other. The references must be viewed without the benefit impermissible hindsight afforded by the claimed invention. In this case, the references do not provide motivation for looking to each other for combination with each other. Furthermore, there is no reason provided why or how the cited steps provide "an inexpensive and easy-to-install means for monitoring an area" or why the steps would motivate the combination of Tani et al. and Goldberg.

Additionally, according to MPEP § 2143.01, there are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art. No motivation has been provided by any of these sources. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Tani et al. with the teachings of Goldberg.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 5, and 7 over Goldberg and Fish, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Goldberg and Fish for the same reasons there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Goldberg and Tani et al.

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 12

Fish discloses an apparatus for monitoring a particular location for the occurrence of a predetermined condition thereat. The apparatus includes a transmitter located at the monitored location for normally transmitting a series of first electrical signals at a predetermined repetition rate and in a predetermined time slot; a receiver for receiving the first electrical signals; a sensor for sensing the predetermined conditions; a signalling device; control means effective, upon sensing the predetermined condition, to interrupt the transmission of the first electrical signals at the predetermined repetition rate to indicate that the predetermined condition has occurred, and to initiate the transmission of a series of second electrical signals at the same repetition rate as the first electrical signals to identify the predetermined condition that has occurred; and a logic circuit for automatically enabling the receiver to receive the first and second electrical signals transmitted by the transmitter just before their expected arrival time, and disabling the receiver from receiving the first and second electrical signals just after their expected termination time (col. 1, lines 36-57).

Again, there is no motivation to combine Goldberg and Fish for the same reasons there is no motivation to combine Goldberg and Tani et al.

For example, Goldberg does not disclose utilizing time slots for transmissions. In particular, col. 13, lines 7-11 expressly state responses are transmitted simultaneously. "Simultaneously" means at the same time, not necessarily in assigned time slots. Furthermore, simultaneous transmission may include frequency division multiplexed transmissions or code division multiplexed transmissions. These transmission techniques are not time slot transmission techniques. Thus, it is not even inherent in Goldberg to utilize time slots for transmissions.

The Office Action admits the features of detecting and selecting are not taught by Goldberg, but alleges these features are obvious in view of Fish

Applicant asserts neither Goldberg nor Fish provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Goldberg with the teachings of Fish. Goldberg does not offer any such motivation. In particular, Goldberg is expressly directed to the collision problem that results from multiple responses to a poll (col. 1, lines 15-50, and specifically, lines 36-44). There is no disclosure of using such a poll in a security system. Thus, there is no reason to apply the teachings of Goldberg to a security system. In fact, Goldberg has no disclosure of any

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 13

relationship to security systems. Goldberg only recognizes collisions may result from multiple responses to a poll. In fact, Goldberg entirely directs all disclosed methods to specifically responding to a poll (col. 1, lines 9-11 and lines 54-57 and col. 2, lines 13-15). Thus, Goldberg does not even fathom any problem or offer any improvement that would provide motivation to modify the teachings of Fish. Additionally, there is no motivation in Goldberg to improve on any method other than a method of responding to a poll. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the poll responding method of Goldberg to modify the monitoring system of Fish

Furthermore, Fish also does not offer any motivation to combine the references. In particular, Fish does not identify any problem or offer any improvements over Goldberg. More particularly, Fish only addresses monitoring systems for producing a warning upon the occurrence of a predetermined condition (col.1, lines 8-11). Fish does not even mention any improvement on radio communication systems that utilize polling. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the security system of Fish to modify the poll responding method of Goldberg. In fact, neither Fish, nor Goldberg identify any usefulness of selecting a plurality of canned messages corresponding to a plurality of orthogonal codes in response to a triggering event.

Also, the Office Action alleges Fish is in an analogous art to Goldberg. Applicant disagrees. In particular, Goldberg is in a non-analogous art to both Fish and the present invention. According to MPEP § 2141.01(a), "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, the be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." However, Goldberg does not relate to sending canned messages in response to triggering events not controlled by a wireless system. Goldberg is directed to a method for generating a simulcast response to a poll(col. 1, lines 8-11). To the contrary, the claimed invention does not require the use of any polling.

Furthermore, Fish is directed to an entirely different field from Goldberg. Fish is directed to security systems that may transmit emergency data via radio. There is no mention in Fish of sending responses to polls. Furthermore, there is no mention in Goldberg of security systems.

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 14

The only similarity between the two references is that both mention wireless communications. However, due to the fact that wireless communications is such a diverse field, this similarity does not rise to similar arts. In particular, Goldberg is narrowly directed to radio communication systems that utilize polling. To the contrary, Fish et al has no mention of such polling. Fish only mentions radio communications in a broad sense to address security systems. Therefore, Fish is in a non-analogous art to Goldberg.

The Office Action alleges one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would modify the method of Fish as taught by Goldberg because the use of orthogonal codes enable a receiver or central controller to correctly identify interfering messages while increasing the number of response transmissions per channel in a given time slot, thus improving the system's functionality and efficiency. Applicant disagrees. The purpose of Goldberg is not to increase the number of response transmissions per channel in a given time slot. There is absolutely no disclosure of such a result. In fact, Goldberg teaches away from such a disclosure. In particular, Goldberg expressly discloses the necessity for repolling portable units because portable units will be missed by the original poll (col. 11, lines 1-6). Thus, multiple interfering responses must be rescheduled and do not efficiently increase the number of response transmissions per channel.

More importantly, Fish teaches away from a combination with Goldberg. In particular, Fish teaches the use of specific timing using predetermined repetition rates (col. 7, lines 26-65). Fish further teaches the importance of the timing of the pulses. In particular, a signaling device such as an alarm 25 is actuated when the pulses are interrupted (col. 6, lines 35-40 and col. 7, lines 61-65). Thus, specific timing is essential to the operation of the system disclosed by Fish. The polling system and repolling system of Goldberg would interrupt the specific timing disclosed by Fish and thus generate faulty alarm signals. Thus, not only does Fish teach away from a combination with Goldberg, the two systems cannot be combined.

Additionally, according to MPEP § 2143.01, there are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art. No motivation has been

Serial No. 09/611,633
Page 15

provided by any of these sources. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Fish with the teachings of Goldberg.

Regarding the rejection of claims 11 and 13 over Goldberg and Lemelson, there is no motivation to combine Goldberg and Lemelson for at least the same reasons there is no motivation to combine Goldberg and Tani et al. or Goldberg and Fish.

Thus, there is no motivation to combine any of the references to achieve the invention claimed in independent claim 1, and similarly claimed in independent claims 11 and 16.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, and 16 define patentable subject matter. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 16

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this Amendment or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew C. Loppnow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,314

Dated: April 16, 2003

Phone No. (847) 523-2585
Fax No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property
600 North U.S. Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

Serial No. 09/611,633

Page 17

Version with markings to show changes made**IN THE CLAIMS:**

Please amend claim 16 as follows:

16. (Amended) A wireless processing device in a wireless communication system for decoding a plurality of canned messages, the wireless processing device comprising:

a transceiver for receiving the plurality of canned messages; and

a processor coupled to the transceiver for processing the plurality of canned messages, wherein the plurality of canned messages are represented by a corresponding plurality of orthogonal codes chosen such that when a group of different canned messages are received simultaneously by the wireless processing device, thereby producing an interference symbol pattern, the interference symbol pattern provides a non-zero probability of correctly decoding at least some of said group, and a substantially zero probability of erroneously decoding a canned message not in said group, and

wherein the processor is programmed to:

cooperate with the transceiver to receive at least two different canned messages sent during a single time slot, the at least two different canned messages selected in response to a triggering event, thereby producing the interference symbol pattern; and

decode at least some of the at least two different canned messages from the interference symbol pattern.